



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,030	03/27/2006	Robertus Theodorus Van Schaijk	NL03 1167 US1	8030
65913	7550	07/26/2010		
NXP, B.V. NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & LICENSING M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE SAN JOSE, CA 95131			EXAMINER HSIEH, HSIN YI	
			ART UNIT 2811	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/26/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/574,030

## Applicant(s)

VAN SCHAIJK ET AL.

## Examiner

Hsin-Yi (Steven) Hsieh

## Art Unit

2811

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10, 11 and 13-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, and 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-7, 14 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Claim 17-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 17 recites "using the spacers to mask underlying portions of the interlayer dielectric layer and the first conductive layer" in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> lines of the claim, which lacks the full support of the original disclose. The specification discloses a method of using both the cap layer 55 and the spacers 81 to mask underlying portions of the interlayer dielectric layer and the first conductive layer (Spec, page 9 lines 14-19). Please note that there are no underlying portions of the interlayer dielectric layer under the spacers 81. Without the cap layer, the interlayer dielectric layer can not be masked. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected because they depend on the rejected claim 17.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 17 recites the limitation "the tunnel dielectric layer" in the 5<sup>th</sup> line of the claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claims 18-19 are rejected because they depend on the rejected claim 17.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. **Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 17-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (US 5,991,204 A) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,488,579 A), and further in view of Quirk et al. ("Semiconductor Manufacturing Technology", 2001, Prentice Hall, pages 456 and 459-461).

9. Chang teaches, regarding to **claim 1**, a method of manufacturing on a substrate (semiconductor substrate 100; Fig. 1a, col. 3 line 58) a 2-transistor memory cell (Flash EEPROM cell; Abstract) comprising a storage transistor (the transistor formed under 101) having a memory gate stack (the gate stack under 101) and a selecting transistor (the transistor under 107), there being a tunnel dielectric layer (floating gate oxide layer 104; Fig. 1a, col. 4 lines 2-3)

between the substrate (100) and the memory gate stack (the gate stack under 101), the method comprising: forming the memory gate stack (the gate stack under 101) by providing a first conductive layer (floating gate poly 103 in Fig. 6a before the etching) on the tunnel dielectric layer (104; see Fig. 1a) and a second conductive layer (second poly; col. 8 lines 55-58) with a deposited interlayer dielectric layer (layer 102 of ONO; Fig. 1a, col. 3 lines 64-65) between the first and second conductive layers (103 and 101; see Fig. 1a), the deposited interlayer dielectric layer (102) including oxide (oxide/nitride/oxide; col. 3 lines 64-65) and being susceptible to undesirable growth upon exposure to oxygen during subsequent oxidation steps (the interlayer dielectric layer 102 is between two polysilicon layers and is susceptible to undesirable growth if two polysilicon layers exposed to oxygen during subsequent oxidation steps), etching the second conductive layer (second poly) thus forming a control gate (101; Fig. 6a, col. 8 lines 55-58), forming spacers (control gate spacer 106; Fig. 6a, col. 8 lines 62-65) against the control gate (101) in the direction of a channel (active channel region 113; Fig. 1a, col. 3 line 62; the direction of channel is the direction from the source to drain) to be formed under the tunnel dielectric layer (104; see Fig. 1a), and thereafter using the spacers (106) as a hard mask (col. 8 lines 62-65) to etch the first conductive layer (floating gate poly 103 in Fig. 6a before the etching) thus forming the floating gate (floating gate poly 103 in Fig. 6b after the etching), removing a portion of the tunnel dielectric (104) laterally adjacent to the floating gate (103) and exposing a portion of the substrate (100) where the tunnel dielectric (104) has been removed (see Fig. 6b, col. 9 lines 1-2); and forming an access gate dielectric oxide (erase gate oxide 112; Fig. 6c, col. 9 lines 3-4) on the exposed portion of the substrate (100; see Fig. 6c), using the spacers (106) to mitigate the diffusion of oxygen to the deposited interlayer dielectric layer (102; the

spacer 106 covers the interlayer dielectric layer 102 that oxygen has to diffuse across the spacer before reaching the interlayer dielectric layer, which means the diffusion of oxygen to 102 is mitigated by the extra diffusing process across the spacer), and regarding to **claim 17**, a method of manufacturing a two-transistor memory cell (Flash EEPROM cell; Abstract) comprising a storage transistor (the transistor formed under 101) having a memory gate stack (the gate stack under 101) and a selecting transistor (the transistor under 107), the method comprising: forming a tunnel dielectric (floating gate oxide layer 104; Fig. 1a, col. 4 lines 2-3) on a substrate (semiconductor substrate 100; Fig. 1a, col. 3 line 58); forming a first conductive layer (floating gate poly 103 in Fig. 6a before the etching) on the tunnel dielectric layer (104; see Fig. 1a); depositing an interlayer dielectric layer (layer 102 of ONO; Fig. 1a, col. 3 lines 64-65) on the first conductive layer (103), the deposited interlayer dielectric layer (102) including oxide (oxide/nitride/oxide; col. 3 lines 64-65) and being susceptible to undesirable growth upon exposure to oxygen during subsequent oxidation steps (the interlayer dielectric layer 102 is between two polysilicon layers and is susceptible to undesirable growth if two polysilicon layers exposed to oxygen during subsequent oxidation steps); forming a second conductive layer (second poly; col. 8 lines 55-58) on the interlayer dielectric layer (102; Fig. 1a); etching the second conductive layer (second poly) to form a control gate (101; Fig. 6a, col. 8 lines 55-58); forming a selecting transistor (the transistor under 107) on the substrate (100; Fig. 6c) laterally adjacent to the first conductive layer (103) and having an access gate (107) on an access gate dielectric (erase gate oxide 112; Fig. 6c, col. 9 lines 3-4); forming spacers (106) against sides of the control gate (101; Fig. 6a), one of the spacers (106) being formed between the control gate (101) and the access gate (107; see Fig. 6c); using the spacers (106) to mask underlying portions

of the interlayer dielectric layer (102) and the first conductive layer (103; Fig. 6a), etching the first conductive layer (103) to form a floating gate (103; col. 8 lines 62-65); forming a floating gate sidewall dielectric (poly tunnel oxide 109; Fig. 6c, col. 9 lines 3-6) that is contiguous with the access gate dielectric (112; see Fig. 1a) and present between the floating gate (103) and the access gate (107; Fig. 1a), wherein the one of the spacers (106) being formed between the control gate (101) and the access gate (107) is thicker than the floating gate sidewall dielectric (109; see Fig. 1a); removing a portion of the tunnel dielectric (104) laterally adjacent to the floating gate (103) and exposing a portion of the substrate (100) where the tunnel dielectric (104) has been removed (see Fig. 6b, col. 9 lines 1-2); and forming an access gate dielectric oxide (erase gate oxide 112; Fig. 6c, col. 9 lines 3-4) on the exposed portion of the substrate (100; see Fig. 6c and col. 9 lines 3-4), using the spacers (106) to mitigate the diffusion of oxygen to the deposited interlayer dielectric layer (102; the spacer 106 covers the interlayer dielectric layer 102 that oxygen has to diffuse across the spacer before reaching the interlayer dielectric layer, which means the diffusion of oxygen to 102 is mitigated by the extra diffusing process across the spacer).

Chang does not teach, regarding to **claim 1**, the spacers being formed from a dielectric material having an oxygen diffusion through the dielectric material that is, relative to oxide spacers, an order of magnitude smaller than oxygen diffusion through the oxide spacers, the etching of the first conductive layer being an anisotropic dry etch that is selective to the tunnel dielectric, thereby using the tunnel dielectric to protect portions of the substrate laterally adjacent to the floating gate; regarding to **claim 3**, the dielectric material having an oxygen diffusion through the material that is an order of magnitude smaller than oxygen diffusion through oxide

spacers includes one or more of silicon nitride, silicon carbide or meal oxide, and regarding to **claim 17**, the spacers being formed from a dielectric material having an oxygen diffusion through the dielectric material that is, relative to oxide spacers, an order of magnitude smaller than oxygen diffusion through the oxide spacers, form a floating gate using an anisotropic dry etch that is selective to the tunnel dielectric, using the tunnel dielectric to mask portions of the substrate laterally adjacent to the floating gate.

In the same field of nonvolatile memory, Sharma et al. teach, regarding to **claim 1**, the spacers (nitride sidewall spacer 37; Fig. 2, col. 4 line 52) being formed from a dielectric material (silicon nitride) having an oxygen diffusion through the dielectric material that is, relative to oxide spacers, an order of magnitude smaller than oxygen diffusion through the oxide spacers (silicon nitride has the oxygen diffusion an order of magnitude small than that of the oxide), and regarding to **claim 3**, the dielectric material (silicon nitride; col. 4 line 52) having an oxygen diffusion through the material that is an order of magnitude smaller than oxygen diffusion through oxide spacers includes one or more of silicon nitride, silicon carbide or meal oxide (silicon nitride), and regarding to **claim 17**, the spacers (nitride sidewall spacer 37; Fig. 2, col. 4 line 52) being formed from a dielectric material (silicon nitride) having an oxygen diffusion through the dielectric material that is, relative to oxide spacers, an order of magnitude smaller than oxygen diffusion through the oxide spacers (silicon nitride has the oxygen diffusion an order of magnitude small than that of the oxide).

Sharma et al. also teach that the nitride spacer smoothes the topography created by the polysilicon gate and eliminates any sharp corners or edges of polysilicon gate from protruding into overlying layers (col. 4 lines 55-58).



In the same field of semiconductor manufacturing, Quirk et al. teach, regarding to **claim 1**, the etching of the first conductive layer (poly gate etch; Fig. 16.29, page 460, fourth paragraph) being an anisotropic dry etch (page 459, bottom paragraph and page 460, 4th paragraph) that is selective to the tunnel dielectric (i.e. gate oxide; page 460, 4th paragraph), thereby using the tunnel dielectric (gate oxide) to protect portions of the substrate laterally adjacent to the floating gate (avoiding any microtrenching of the gate oxide around the periphery of the polysilicon; page 460, the bottom paragraph), and regarding to **claim 17**, form a floating gate (poly gate, which can be a floating gate; Fig. 16.29, page 460, fourth paragraph) using an anisotropic dry etch (page 459, bottom paragraph and page 460, 4th paragraph) that is selective to the tunnel dielectric (i.e. gate oxide; page 460, 4th paragraph), using the tunnel dielectric (i.e. gate oxide) to mask portions of the substrate laterally adjacent to the floating gate (avoiding any microtrenching of the gate oxide around the periphery of the polysilicon; page 460, the bottom paragraph).

Quirk et al. also teach that dry etch can provides high selectivity and low device damage (page 456, the bottom two paragraphs)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the inventions of Chang, Sharma et al. and Quirk et al. using the nitride spacers as taught by Sharma et al. and the dry etch during the gate formation as taught by Quirk et al., because the nitride spacer smoothes the topography created by the polysilicon gate and eliminates any sharp corners or edges of polysilicon gate from protruding into overlying layers as taught by Sharma et al and dry etch can provides high selectivity and low device damage as taught by Quirk et al.

10. Regarding **claim 5**, Chang also teaches a method according to claim 1, further including forming a floating gate dielectric (poly tunnel oxide 109; Fig. 6c, col. 9 lines 3-6) next to the formed floating gate (103) while forming the access gate dielectric (erased gate oxide 112; Fig. 6c, col. 9 lines 3-6).

11. Regarding **claim 7**, Chang also teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein, forming an access gate (107) includes forming the access gate while the spacer (106) at the access gate (107) side is still present (see Fig. 6c).

12. Regarding **claim 18**, Chang also teaches the method of claim 17, further comprising forming a cap layer (oxide cap 601; Fig. 6b, col. 8, lines 62-63) on the second conductive layer (101), wherein forming spacers (106) includes forming the one spacer (106), which is formed between the control gate (101) and the access gate (107; see Fig. 6c), between the cap layer (601) and the access gate (107) and in contact with the cap layer (601), the control gate (101), the access gate (107) and the floating gate (103; see Fig. 6c).

13. Regarding **claim 19**, Chang also teaches the method of claim 17, further comprising forming a cap layer (oxide cap 601; Fig. 6b, col. 8, lines 62-63) on the second conductive layer (101), wherein forming spacers includes forming the one spacer (the left 106), which is formed between the control gate (101) and the access gate (107; see Fig. 1a), between the cap layer (601) and the access gate (107) and in contact with the cap layer (601), the control gate (101), the access gate (107) and the floating gate (103; see Fig. 6c), further including forming another floating gate sidewall dielectric (109 at the right hand side of 103 in Fig. 6c) located on a sidewall (right sidewall) of the floating gate (103) opposite from the floating gate sidewall dielectric (109 at the left hand side of 103 in Fig. 6c), and further including forming offset

spacers (106), one of the offset spacers (106 at the left hand side of 101 in Fig. 6c) being in contact with the access gate (107; see Fig. 6c), and another one of the offset spacers (106 at the right hand side of 101 in Fig. 6c) being in contact with the other floating gate sidewall dielectric (109 at the right hand side of 103 in Fig. 6c) and in contact with another one of the spacers (106 at the right hand side of 101 in Fig. 6c) that is located on a side (right side) of the control gate (101) opposite from the one spacer (106 at the left hand side of 101; see Fig. 6c).

14. **Claims 4 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, Sharma and Quirk et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hong et al. (US 5,614,746 A).

Chang teaches, regarding to **claim 4**, before forming the memory gate stack, applying the tunnel dielectric layer (104) on the substrate (100; this is shown in Fig. 6a), and after formation of the memory gate stack (see Fig. 6b), removing the tunnel dielectric layer (104) by a selective etching technique (stripping, col. 9 lines 1-2) at least at a location where the selecting transistor is to be formed (all the exposed area including the selecting transistor region; col. 9 lines 1-2), and regarding **claim 14**, removing a portion of the tunnel dielectric (104; see Fig. 6b, col. 9 lines 1-9) includes removing a portion of the tunnel dielectric laterally adjacent to the floating gate (103) and expose a portion of the substrate surface (100) (see Fig. 6b, col. 9 lines 1-9), and further including forming an access gate (erase gate 107; Fig. 6c, col. 4 line 7) of the selecting transistor (the transistor under 107) on the access gate dielectric (erase gate oxide 112; Fig. 6c, col. 9 lines 1-9).

Chang, Sharma and Quirk et al. do not teach, regarding to **claim 4**, the selective etching technique preferentially etching the tunnel dielectric layer compared to the substrate, and

regarding to **claim 14**, wet etching the tunnel dielectric to remove a portion of the tunnel dielectric and expose a portion of the substrate surface where the tunnel dielectric has been wet etched, leaving the exposed surface of the substrate intact.

In the same field of nonvolatile memory, Hong et al. teach, regarding to **claim 4**, the selective etching technique (wet etching; Fig. 3E, col. 6 lines 58-61) preferentially etching the tunnel dielectric layer (tunnel oxide layer 22; Fig. 3E, col. 6 lines 58-61) compared to the substrate (top surface of P-substrate 21; Fig. 3E, col. 6 lines 65-66), and regarding to **claim 14**, wet etching the tunnel dielectric (tunnel oxide layer 22; Fig. 3E, col. 6 lines 58-61) to remove a portion (exposed portion) of the tunnel dielectric (22) and expose a portion of the substrate surface (top surface of P-substrate 21; Fig. 3E, col. 6 lines 65-66) where the tunnel dielectric (22) has been wet etched (see Fig. 3E), leaving the exposed surface of the substrate intact (see Fig. 3E).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the inventions of Chang, Sharma, Quirk et al. and Hong et al. to use the wet etch to remove the tunnel oxide because Chang, Sharma and Quirk et al. is silent of how to remove the tunnel oxide and Hong et al. provide a method of wet etch to remove the tunnel oxide.

15. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, Sharma and Quirk et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chen (US 6,091,104 A).

Regarding **claim 6**, Chang teaches a method according to claim 1, furthermore comprising removing part of the interlayer dielectric layer (102) before forming the spacers (this

can be shown in Fig. 6a and Fig. 6b, where 102 is left only under the control gate 101 and is enclosed by the spacer 106).

Chang, Sharma and Quirk et al. do not teach removing part of the interlayer dielectric layer after forming the control gate.

In the same field of nonvolatile memory, Chen teaches removing part of the interlayer dielectric layer after forming the control gate (col. 4 lines 64-67). Chen also teaches that the control gate is used as mask that only one lithographical mask is needed to form the gate stack (col. 4 lines 44-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the inventions of Chang, Sharma, Quirk et al. and Chen and remove the interlayer dielectric layer after forming the control gate as taught by Chen, because only one lithographical mask is needed to form the gate stack as taught by Chen.

### ***Response to Arguments***

16. On pages 8-9 of Applicant's Response regarding the restriction, Applicant argues that the instant Office Action fails to establish such prima facie burden in attempting to support the restriction by asserting that "there were a lot of amendments." Moreover, the amendments in various restricted claims (in response to which the restriction requirement was issued) were relatively minor.

17. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument, because the examiner really found undue burden during the execution. The claims include both device claims and

method claims with multiple amendments. Thus the examiner followed the MPEP to restrict the application using "Lack of Unity of Invention" for this application is a 371 filing.

18. On page 9 of Applicant's Response, Applicant argues that 103(a) rejections are improper referring to page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner's assertion that "an element [that] is adapted to perform a function is not a positive limitation" is inapplicable to method-based limitations including those directed to "using the spacers to mitigate the diffusion of oxygen to the deposited interlayer dielectric layer." Furthermore, the Examiner's reliance upon In re Hutchinson regarding these "adapted to" assertions apply to claims using these terms, whereas these terms are not present in any of the instant claims.

19. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument, because the page 10 of the Office Action is the response to the argument addressing the Applicant's argument of the functional limitation of the spacer being able to mitigate the diffusion of the oxygen to the deposited interlayer dielectric layer. The examiner just wants to emphasize in the response that the functional limitation is not a positive limitation. Most importantly, the examiner explained in the Office Action rejection that oxide spacer also is able to mitigate the diffusion of the oxygen to deposited interlayer dielectric layer.

20. On pages 9-10 of Applicant's Response, Applicant argues that the Examiner's assertion that the secondary '579 reference teaches using spacers to mitigate the diffusion of oxygen to a deposited interlayer dielectric layer, "[b]ecause the oxygen has to diffuse across the spacer before reaching the interlayer dielectric layer" is erroneous.

21. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument, because it is true that the oxygen has to diffuse across the spacer before reaching the interlayer dielectric layer. Thus

the spacer, such as the oxide spacer or nitride spacer can mitigate the diffusion of the oxygen to the deposited interlayer dielectric layer. This phenomenon is well known in the field of semiconductor industry: the growth rate of the oxidation of the silicon decrease dramatically when the thickness of the silicon oxide gets thicker because the oxygen has to diffuse across the silicon oxide to reach the silicon and react with the silicon. The oxide spacer or the nitride spacer can mitigate the diffusion of the oxygen to the deposited interlayer dielectric layer.

22. On pages 10-11 of Applicant's Response, Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the cited inverted-gate manufacturing approach of the '579 reference with the gate stack manufacturing steps of the '204 reference. Specifically, the Examiner has failed to provide any explanation as to how the inverted-gate manufacturing approach in the "579 reference, which uses a nitride spacer 37 to "smooth the topography created by the polysilicon gate 36" and to address specific problems with inverted-gate structures as in FIG. 3, would apply to the conventional gate stack of the EEPROM device in the '204 reference.

23. In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, the examiner provides the motivation that the nitride spacer smoothes the topography created by the polysilicon gate and eliminates any sharp corners or edges of

polysilicon gate from protruding into overlying layers (col. 4 lines 55-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the nitride spacer due to this motivation.

24. On page 11 of Applicant's Response, Applicant argues that the Office Action has also failed to establish motivation to combine the dry etch of the Quirk reference with the '204. The alleged motivation to combine the Quirk reference with the '204 reference is to provide "high selectivity and low device damage" but is silent as to how these features would be applicable to the conventional gate structure of the '204 reference or how the '204 reference could function as such.

25. In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, the examiner provides the motivation that the dry etch can provide high selectivity and low device damage (page 456, the bottom two paragraphs). This motivation is well known in the industry and the process is used frequently. Quirk reference is disclosing a well know process in the industry.



***Conclusion***

26. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hsin-Yi (Steven) Hsieh whose telephone number is 571-270-3043. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne A. Gurley can be reached on 571-272-1670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lynne A. Gurley/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2811

/H. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2811  
7/17/2010